# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 1 of 8

			ПТ 0.6	PART				III 8.57	PART II			DAI	RT III
					33413(b)(1)				Section 33	VELOPED			
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.		9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
LAMEDA COUNTY ALAMEDA CITY							9		9	1	1	1	1
EMERYVILLE							22		22	3	1	3	1
FREMONT													
HAYWARD													
LIVERMORE		7		7	2	1						To 11. Sum #4+#9*  1 3 2 45 26 5 82 12 11 23	1
OAKLAND							298		298	45	18	45	18
SAN LEANDRO		83	2	85	26	13						26	13
UNION CITY							35		35	5	2	5	2
	County Totals:	90	2	92	28	14	364		364	55	22	82	36
CHICO							80		80	12	5	12	5
OROVILLE							72		72	11	4	11	4
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY BRENTWOOD	County Totals:						152		152	23	9	23	9
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY													
PITTSBURG													
RICHMOND							73		73	11	4	11	4
resno COUNTY CLOVIS	County Totals:	2		2	1	0	73		73	11	4	11 1	0
FIREBAUGH		10		10	3	2						3	2
FRESNO CITY													
ORANGE COVE		10		10	3	2						3	2
-	County Totals:	22		22	7	3						7	3

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 2 of 8

			[H&S	PART SC Section	TI 33413(b)(1)			[H&SC	PART II			PART III		
					ELOPED					VELOPED			TALS	
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10	
HUMBOLDT COUNTY ARCATA														
EUREKA			1	1	0	0						0	0	
	County Totals:		1	1	0	0						0	0	
KERN COUNTY BAKERSFIELD														
CALIFORNIA CITY							8		8	1	0	1	0	
RIDGECREST		2		2	1	0						1	0	
SHAFTER							4		4	1	0	1	0	
TAFT														
	County Totals:	2		2	1	0	12		12	2	1	2	1	
KINGS COUNTY LEMOORE		1		1	0	0	56		56	8	3	9	4	
	County Totals:	1		1	0	0	56		56	8	3	9	4	
LAKE COUNTY CLEARLAKE							108		108	16	6	16	6	
LAKE COUNTY														
LOS ANGELES COUNTY AZUSA	County Totals:						108		108	16	6	16	6	
BELLFLOWER		6		6	2	1	3		3	0	0	2	1	
DUARTE														
GLENDALE							43		43	6	3	6	3	
LANCASTER							28		28	4	2	4	2	
LONG BEACH							124	16	140	21	8	21	8	
LOS ANGELES CITY		204		204	61	31	354	67	421	63	25	124	56	

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 3 of 8

			AGE	NCY DEV	33413(b)(1) ELOPED		PART II [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)NONAGENCY DEVELOPED					PART IIITOTALS		
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10	
PALMDALE							161		161	24	10	24	10	
POMONA		1		1	0	0						0	0	
SAN GABRIEL														
SANTA MONICA							46		46	7	3	7	3	
SIGNAL HILL														
SOUTH EL MONTE														
WEST COVINA														
WEST HOLLYWOOD														
AADERA COUNTY	County Totals:	211		211	63	32	759	83	842	126	51	190	82	
MADERA CITY		3	3	6	2	1						2	1	
	County Totals:	3	3	6	2	1						2	1	
IERCED COUNTY MERCED CITY							3		3	0	0	0	0	
	County Totals:						3		3	0	0	0	0	
ONTEREY COUNTY MONTEREY CITY		36		36	11	5	18		18	3	1	14	6	
MONTEREY COUNTY														
SALINAS							83		83	12	5	12	5	
SEASIDE														
ORANGE COUNTY	County Totals:	36		36	11	5	101		101	15	6	26	11	
DRANGE COUNTY ANAHEIM							362		362	54	22	54	22	
BUENA PARK														
COSTA MESA														
FOUNTAIN VALLEY				_			7		7	1	0	1	0	

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 4 of 8

			пъ	PART SC Section	1 33413(b)(1)			(H&SC	PART II			PAI	RT III
										VELOPED			TALS
		1. New Units		3. Sum #1+#2		5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.		9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
GARDEN GROVE													
HUNTINGTON BEACH													
ORANGE CITY							2		2	0	0	0	0
ORANGE COUNTY							37		37	6	2	6	2
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO		10		10	3	2	38		38	6	2	9	4
SANTA ANA													
STANTON													
TUSTIN							20		20	3	1	3	1
	County Totals:	10		10	3	2	466		466	70	28	73	29
PLACER COUNTY PLACER COUNTY													
ROCKLIN													
ROSEVILLE							6		6	1	0	1	0
	County Totals:						6		6	1	0	1	0
RIVERSIDE COUNTY CATHEDRAL CITY							75		75	11	5	11	5
DESERT HOT SPRINGS													
INDIO		79		79	24	12						24	12
LA QUINTA		80		80	24	12	49	1	50	8	3	32	15
PALM DESERT													
RIVERSIDE CITY													
RIVERSIDE COUNTY		9		9	3	1						3	1
TEMECULA							264		264	40	16	40	16
	County Totals:	168		168	50	25	388	1	389	58	23	109	49
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SACRAMENTO CITY							112		112	17	7	17	7

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 5 of 8

			AGE	NCY DEV	33413(b)(1) ELOPED			NONAG		413(b)(2) VELOPED		ТО	RT III TALS
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%		11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
SACRAMENTO COUNTY							140		140	21	8	21	8
	County Totals:						252		252	38	15	38	15
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY CHINO		2		2	1	0	119		119	18	7	18	7
COLTON			1	1	0	0						0	0
GRAND TERRACE							120		120	18	7	18	7
HESPERIA							64		64	10	4	10	4
HIGHLAND													
MONTCLAIR													
ONTARIO							301		301	45	18	45	18
RANCHO CUCAMONGA		131		131	39	20						39	20
RIALTO													
SAN BERNARDINO CITY							101		101	15	6	15	6
VICTOR VALLEY							19		19	3	1	3	1
VICTORVILLE													
AN DIEGO COUNTY	County Totals:	133	1	134	40	20	724		724	109	43	149	64
CHULA VISTA							41		41	6	2	6	2
CORONADO							42		42	6	3	6	3
EL CAJON		2		2	1	0						1	0
NATIONAL CITY		85		85	26	13						26	13
POWAY													
SAN DIEGO CITY							513		513	77	31	77	31
SAN MARCOS													
SANTEE													

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 6 of 8

			AGE	NCY DEV	33413(b)(1) ELOPED				PART II Section 33 ENCY DE	3413(b)(2) VELOPED		TO	RT III TALS
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%		11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
VISTA													
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY SAN FRANCISCO	County Totals:	87		87	26	13	596		596	89	36	116	49
SAN FRANCISCO	C ( T ( )						50		50	8	3	8	3
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MANTECA	County Totals:						50		50	8	3	8	3
STOCKTON								44	44	7	3	7	3
TRACY							50	88	138	21	8	21	8
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY ATASCADERO	County Totals:						<b>50</b>	132	<b>182</b>	27	<b>11</b> 0	27 1	<b>11</b> 0
GROVER BEACH							<u> </u>						
PASO ROBLES													
SAN MATEO COUNTY DALY CITY	County Totals:						<b>4</b> 40		<b>4</b> 40	1	<b>0</b> 2	1	<b>0</b> 2
MENLO PARK							10		10				
MILLBRAE		10		10	3	2	95		95	14	6	17	7
SAN MATEO CITY													-
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO													
San Mateo County COUNTY REDWOOD CITY	County Totals:	10		10	3	2	135		135	20	8	23	10
	County Totals:												
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY LOMPOC							42		42	6	3	6	3

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 7 of 8

			AGE	ENCY DEV	33413(b)(1) ELOPED					3413(b)(2) VELOPED		ТО	RT III TALS
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
	County Totals:						42		42	6	3	6	3
SANTA CLARA COUNTY MILPITAS							419		419	63	25	63	25
MORGAN HILL							35		35	5	2	5	2
SAN JOSE							116		116	17	7	17	7
	County Totals:						570		570	86	34	86	34
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CAPITOLA							2		2	0	0	0	0
SANTA CRUZ CITY							103		103	15	6	15	6
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY							3		3	0	0	0	0
	County Totals:						108		108	16	6	16	6
SHASTA COUNTY REDDING							2		2	0	0	0	0
SHASTA LAKE													
	County Totals:						2		2	0	0	0	0
SOLANO COUNTY DIXON							2		2	0	0	0	0
FAIRFIELD													
VACAVILLE							60		60	9	4	9	4
	County Totals:						62		62	9	4	9	4
SONOMA COUNTY PETALUMA							57		57	9	3	9	3
SANTA ROSA													
SEBASTOPOL							47		47	7	3	7	3
	County Totals:						104		104	16	6	16	6
STANISLAUS COUNTY CERES							18		18	3	1	3	1

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

# California Redevelopment Agencies INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR

Exhibit G Page 8 of 8

					33413(b)(1)				PART II	413(b)(2)			RT III
		1. New Units	AGE 2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	NONAG 7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	<b>VELOPED</b> 9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10.VLow #9x 40%	TO 11. Sum #4+#9*	TALS 12. VLow #5+#10
MODESTO							150		150	23	9	23	9
STANISLAUS COUNTY													
STANISLAUS-CERES							1		1	0	0	0	0
ΓULARE COUNTY	County Totals:						169		169	25	10	25	10
DINUBA		1		1	0	0						0	0
TULARE COUNTY		28	4	32	10	5	17		17	3	1	12	6
VISALIA							2		2	0	0	0	0
VENTURA COUNTY OXNARD	County Totals:	29	4	33	10	5	<b>19</b> 5		<b>19</b> 5	<b>3</b>	1 0	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b> 0
PORT HUENEME													
SIMI VALLEY		36		36	11	5						11	5
YOLO COUNTY WOODLAND	County Totals:	36		36	11	5	5 136		<b>5</b> 136	1 20	<b>0</b> 8	<b>12</b> 20	<b>6</b> 8
Total Agencies Contributing to	County Totals: this Report: 134	838	11	849	255	127	136 5,516	216	136 5,732	20 860	8 344	20 1,115	8 471

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- Part III #12 is a subset of #11.